

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,144,355 to Murata et al. in view of United States Patent No. 4,713,691 to Tanaka et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the present invention as defined in amended independent Claims 1 and 9. More specifically, neither Murata et al. nor Tanaka et al., alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a liquid crystal display that includes, *inter alia*, a control part that detects a change pattern of the image display data, and adjusts the phase relationship between the clock signal and the image display data according to the detected change pattern, “wherein the adjustment of the phase relationship is carried out for the purpose of eliminating phase difference of a signal disposed at a different position in the data driving part,” as defined in amended independent Claim 1. Similarly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the invention of amended independent Claim 9 which includes, *inter alia*, the following feature: “wherein the timing correcting part makes the clock signal and image display signal supplied by the control part have a predetermined phase relationship therebetween to eliminate a phase difference of a signal disposed at a different position in the data driving part.” The features that have been newly added to Claims 1 and 9 can be found in the original Specification on page 39, lines 20-31, and page 44, lines 9-15, among other places.

The present invention defined in amended independent Claims 1 and 9 relates to correcting timing errors in a liquid crystal display caused by wires of different lengths used within one or more data driving parts. For example, page 2, line 17 through page 4, line 26 of the original specification disclose such a problem concerning differences in signal delay in a liquid crystal display device. More specifically, one example of such a problem relates to the device shown in Applicants' Figure 1, which includes liquid crystal driving circuits M1 through M10, where the wiring lengths of circuits M2 through M10 are longer than the wiring length for circuit M1. Such a difference in length causes difficulties in timing control, as shown in Figures 2A-2C. The present invention of Claims 1 and 9 provides a solution for this problem by adjusting the phase relationship to eliminate the phase difference.

In contrast, as correctly acknowledged by the Examiner, the Murata et al. reference fails to disclose adjusting the phase relationship. *See* Final Office Action, page 3, lines 3-5. Accordingly, the Examiner relied upon the Tanaka et al. reference for this feature. Previously, on page 2 of Response A, Applicants argued that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Tanaka et al. with Murata et al., because, *inter alia*, Murata et al. and Tanaka et al. relate to different technical fields (Murata et al. relates to a display on an LCD panel and Tanaka et al. relates to printing out a video signal). Applicants maintain and incorporate by reference herein those arguments previously advanced, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider those arguments, and withdraw this § 103 rejection.

Additionally, Applicants have now amended independent Claims 1 and 9 to recite additional features related to the elimination of the phase difference. More specifically, both Claims 1 and 9 recite that the predetermined phase relationship eliminates the phase difference of the signal disposed at a different position in the data driving part. Thus, the problem described above is eliminated. In contrast, since the Tanaka et al. reference relates to making a hard copy of an image, the problem at issue, which is relevant to a liquid crystal display device, has no relevance to the device of Tanaka et al. Thus, there is no motivation to modify Murata et al. in light of Tanaka et al. Accordingly, for at least this reason, withdrawal of this §103 rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, even assuming *arguendo* that one would have been motivated to combine Tanaka et al. with Murata et al., the resulting combination would still not include all of the features of the present invention as defined in amended independent Claims 1 and 9. More specifically, neither of the cited references includes any mention of “eliminating phase difference of the signal disposed at a different position in the data driving part,” as defined in amended independent Claim 1. Nor do either of the cited references include any mention of “eliminate[ing] a phase difference of the signal disposed at a different position in the data driving part,” as defined in amended independent Claim 9. Briefly, neither of the cited references disclose or suggest anything about eliminating the phase difference between signals disposed at different positions of the data driving part (i.e., with different wiring lengths). Accordingly, as all of the features of Claims 1 and 9 are not disclosed or suggested


in the cited references, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this § 103 rejection of independent Claims 1 and 9.

Claims 2-5, 10 and 11 all depend from either independent Claim 9 or from independent Claim 11, and therefore include all of the features of either Claim 9 or Claim 11, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the § 103 rejection of dependent Claims 2-5, 10 and 11 under Murata et al. in view of Tanaka et al. be withdrawn considering the above remarks directed to independent Claims 1 and 9.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

James K. Folker

Registration No. 37,538

August 23, 2005

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080

Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\0941\66047\9F3254.DOC